

Provoking the very “Idea” of Canadian Curriculum Studies as a Counterpointed Compositionⁱ

NICHOLAS NG-A-FOOK

University of Ottawa

I’ve long been intrigued by that incredible tapestry of tundra and taiga which constitutes the Arctic and Subarctic of our country. I’ve read about it, written about it and even pulled up my parka once and gone there; yet, like all but a very few Canadians, I’ve had no real experience of the North. I’ve remained, of necessity, an outsider. And the North has remained for me a convenient place to dream about, spin tall tales about, and in the end, avoid.

(Gould, 1967)

The difficulties impeding the development of Canada as a nation are well known. In the last century national leaders struggled against the geographic division of the country and the ethnic differences that isolation and distance magnified. The various peoples who settled Canada were far from being united by a common language, religion, or tradition. In most parts of the country, to this day, feelings of loyalty are divided between the local areas or province and the country as a whole.

(Milburn & Herbert, 1974, p. 4)

Canadian curriculum theorists, working at universities, located in specific provinces (with their own curriculum) are challenged to interpret what is curriculum at this time and in this place? What is its significance? What would be the fitting response of curriculum in this time and place?

(Chambers, 2003, p. 223)

During October of 1992, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) aired *The Idea of Canada*, a musical radio program commissioned to celebrate the 10th anniversary of Glenn Gould's career and death. This radio composition was produced by Steve Wadhams as a counterpoint of ideas, which tried to express Canadians' competing beliefs about the "isnesses" of what constitutes the myths, dreams, and nightmares of our imagined national identity. The composition, its conceptual framework, was

initially inspired by Glenn Gould's experimentations with counterpoint radio documentaries during the 1960s and 1970s with programs like his *Solitude Trilogy* (*The Idea of the North*, 1967; *The Late Comers*, 1969; and *The Quiet in the Land*, 1977) where he explored the mythologies of the north and the effects of isolation (geographical, cultural, and religious) on individuals and communities.ⁱⁱ His documentary radio experimentations, Cushing (2010) tells us, grew out of Gould's interest in the contrapuntal keyboard music of J.S. Bach and Anton Webern. And yet, despite such musical influences, Gould's experimentations with counterpoint radio compositions were not concerned, as Cushing suggests, primarily with traditional music. Instead his counterpoint documentaries combined various musical and documentary elements such as, but not limited to, human voices, environmental sounds, vocal timbres and colours, which through careful editing created scenes and spaces for dramatic dialogues to inhabit an auditory landscape (Cushing, 2010). Moreover, Glenn Gould's worldview, his lived experiences, and sensibility as a Canadian (indeed his *currere*) were deeply connected to, and integrated into, the music he composed, played at concerts as a professional pianist, experimental documentaries he produced for CBC Radio, and the places he lived and visited.

Twenty years later, during the summer of 2012 the CBC re-aired the *Idea of Canada* on a program called *Living Out Loud*.ⁱⁱⁱ The program begins by providing an overview of different historical events, reiterating similar historical themes, like the Québec referendums on separation from Canada, the re-election of the nationalist Parti Québécois in Québec

and other national crises, like the Mohawk standoff at Oka in 1990, and the ongoing *Idle No More* movement across our nation. In different ways, these national crises posed and pose a recursive threat to the very "idea" that Canada exists as a singular unified nation.^{iv} Later, Wadhams describes how Glenn Gould's *Idea of the North* inspired his 1992 production as both a piece of music and a documentary where different fragments of speech and music—news broadcasts, advertisement, interviews, and so on—are used to narrate our mythic national identity (its verticality and horizontality) in stereo, as a storied composition of musical counterpointed movements. Much like this program, the very "idea" of Canadian curriculum studies is bound together by stories of counterpointed historical movements.

Inspired by the nocturnal sensibilities of Ishiguro's stories, Smits (2011) asks us to reconsider, such historical movements within our field as "the play of counterpoint" where scholars might interweave "diverse chords and voices but also discordance or dissidence," offering in turn, both "complexity and the invitation to hear" each other differently (p. 48). Picking up from where Milburn and Herbert (1974), Barrow (1979), Tomkins (1985/2008), Sumara, Davis, and Laidlaw (2001), Cynthia Chambers (1999, 2003, 2006), Smits (2008), and more recently Pinar (2011), and Johnston and Richardson (2012) left us, I would like to suggest that curriculum scholars here in Canada, much like Gould and Wadhams, continue to experiment with curriculum theorizing as a composition of narrative counterpoints, rapprochements, and juxtapositions that pay particular attention "to braiding languages and

traditions, stories and fragments, desires and repulsions, arguments and conversations, tradition and change, hyphens and slashes, mind and body, earth and spirit, texts and images, local and global, pasts and posts, into a *métissage*" (Chambers, 2003, p. 246). Revisiting such counterpointed historical curricular movements and their existing inter/trans/disciplinary synoptic documentations in this inaugural special issue of *Curriculum Conversations* reminds us that the very "idea" of Canadian curriculum studies remains an opportunity for improvised interpretive and reiterative play to *curriculum in a new key* with the uncommon countenances of our differing intellectual histories and respective interpretations.

In what follows then, I provide narrative snapshots of some historical and contemporary works produced by curriculum scholars working at Canadian universities primarily from the last decade. Their works have informed my research and teachings while working as a "privileged" hyphenated, heterosexual, and first generation immigrant male curriculum theorist at the Faculty of Education within the University of Ottawa. To readers and fellow colleagues who are associated (or not) with our larger *Canadian Association of Curriculum Studies* community, I apologize in advance for the many oversights, misinterpretations, and/or exclusions of your works. Like Chambers (2003) regionalism and disciplinary blinders inform my understanding of the vast and rich intellectual and topographic characteristics of our field. Moreover part of my methodological strategy for the initial research that informs this essay is to limit my references to articles

published in curriculum studies journals between 2000 and 2013 by scholars who worked and/or are working at Canadian universities. From there, I selected key texts others or I often use to teach an introductory course to Canadian curriculum studies either at the University of Ottawa and/or elsewhere.

Therefore the narratives I selected, surveyed, and put forth are situated, and thus, partial—as if they could ever be otherwise. At the very least, this bibliography of Canadian curriculum studies might provide a future passageway for readers to revisit, add to, challenge, deconstruct, and play with compositions of our intellectual history anew as documentary experimentations. For this conversational forum, I have attempted to structure this essay into three sections. The first provides an overview of the key texts I engage with graduate students to support them toward becoming more familiar with the historical contexts of our field of study. The second examines some of the different institutional structures through which Canadian curriculum scholars are mobilizing and sharing their research. The last offers a brief synthesis of such historical snapshots in relation to the potential future threats to our field put forth by the current editors in *Curriculum Studies at a Crossroads*. My pedagogical hope then, is that together, this forum might provide an opportunity for us to further situate, quell, and/or provoke some of the threats that inhabit and inhibit a complicated conversation. But before we begin to cast these grandiose, balkanized, contemporary, jargon-ladled, organizational, epistemological and disciplinary discursive threats toward the future, let us survey some of our historically situated

and differing intellectual topographies as we revisit recursive and refractive re/iterations of the very “idea” of Canadian curriculum studies.

Surveying Intellectual Topographies: Recursive Reflections

An authentic radical departure calls for not only a lateral shift to the practical but also a vertical shift that leads us to a deeper understanding of the program developers' theoretic stance. This stance may be implicit or even unconscious, based as it is on assumptions that are frequently taken for granted in dealing with the practical problems of program development.

(Aoki, 1977, p. 51)

Thus I realize in posing the question of Canadian curriculum studies that there is much work to be done in both recovering—and I will put this in the plural—various histories, but to also see them in terms of the complex relationships between groups of people, social forces and the ways that stories get told.

(Smits, 2008, p. 105)

He parlayed surveying into a literary tool. Even as Jorge Luis Borges manipulates mirrors, and Franz Kafka badgers beetles...and as he did so, I began to realize that

his relation to a craft, which has at its subject the land,
enabled him to read these signs of that land to find in the
most minute measurement a suggestion of the infinite to
encompass the universal within the particular.

(Gould, 1967)

In 1964, Glen Gould travelled by train, the Muskeg Express, from Winnipeg to Fort Churchill...some 1015 miles. During this two night, three-day trip, across an eventual topography speckled with stunted ice-pruned Black Spruce, Gould (1967) interviewed a geographer and anthropologist, sociologist, government official, a nurse, and a surveyor to discuss the very 'idea' of the North and its respective nostalgic, romantic, solitary, and ugly mythologies. "At breakfast," Gould (1967) tells us, "he struck up a conversation with one W.V. Maclean." Or, "as he was known along the line, or at the hamlet sightings where his bunk cart was parked, as Wally Maclean". He later invited Wally to be his narrator. The metaphorical significance of Wally Maclean's occupation as a "surveyor," and surveying as a literary tool (albeit, also a colonial one), I suggest, is of particular importance to our historical understandings of Canadian curriculum studies. Indeed, several of our colleagues have at one time or another surveyed the very "idea" of curriculum and read the historical and contemporary intellectual and discursive topographic signs that inform our larger field of study—most notably, George S. Tomkins (1986/2008) and Cynthia Chambers (1999, 2003).

Although revisiting the very “idea” of having a distinct heterogeneous national identity within the broader Canadian field of curriculum studies is no longer novel, a comprehensive introduction to its respective intellectual topographic trends (in terms of their verticality and horizontality), either historical and/or contemporary, remains a difficult task for both experienced and burgeoning curriculum scholars.^v Our difficulty in situating various histories can no longer be attributed to “the lack of readily available Canadian material for courses,” as Gibson (2012) suggests, or sparseness as the editors stress, but rather remains a challenge of organizing, analyzing, synthesizing, and then introducing the plethora of diverse and innovative research generated by past and contemporary curriculum scholars. Nonetheless, as the editors make clear, few comprehensive intellectual histories have been traced directly back to antiquity (Egan, 2003). In this regard, this essay is no exception and shares this curricular and pedagogical challenge, though not as a disciplinary threat, but rather as a provocation to once again ask: Where are we at, in this place and this time, as Canadian curriculum scholars? Since Chambers’ (1999) initial call to develop a curriculum theory of our own, several comprehensive texts have been published that historically document, what Aoki termed some twenty years before, the “lateral” and “vertical” shifts taking place within and across our field of study.^{vi} Nonetheless, as Smits (2008), the editors, and others stress (see Haig-Brown 2008; Kanu & Glor, 2006; Pinar, 2008a, 2008b, 2011; Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013; Weenie, 2008), more work still needs to be done in posing questions of Canadian curriculum

studies in relation to the various untold historical and contemporary narratives (real or imagined) that are studied within and across the provincial school curriculum, the public imaginary, and/or in our intellectual work.

Like Gould and Windham’s radio compositions, the existing body of literature within Canadian curriculum studies in many ways can be understood as thought experimentations. The established ideas in curriculum theorizing and development provide the interdisciplinary foundations for future Canadian scholars to reconsider and/or reconceptualise anew our intellectual reiterations and recursive diffractions of various existing theoretical concepts and innovative research methodologies such as, but not limited, to *A/R/Tography* or life writing as *Indigenous Métissage* (Irwin, 2004; Donald 2009b). Moreover, as Chambers’ (2003) historical survey of the field illustrates, our intellectual trends and national identities can no longer be conceptualized, nor narrated for that matter, through McLennan’s mythology of *Two Solitudes*—a country inspired and founded by what Ralston Saul (2008) subsequently called elsewhere British, French, and European inspiration. Instead curriculum scholars have sought to create, disrupt, complicate, and inspire different possibilities for imagining, recreating and sharing our national mythologies through our curriculum development and theorizing as a form of literary *métissage* (Hasebe-Ludt, Chambers, and Leggo, 2009).^{vii} Indeed since the 1970s, and as I have stated elsewhere (see Ng-A-Fook, 2013a, 2013b), Canadian curriculum theorists, like Cynthia Chambers (2003, 2004b, 2006, 2008,

2012), and others before her like Ted Aoki (1980/2005), have laboured to advance different (alter/native) interpretive meanings of, and for, Canadian curriculum theory in terms of its aesthetic, speculative, and distinct topographic characteristics.^{viii}

At the turn of the 20th century, Chambers (1999) put forth four thought-provoking challenges for Canadian curriculum theorists, policy makers, administrators, practicing teachers, and graduate students to reconsider in their thinking, theorizing and curriculum designs. Chambers asked us then, to rewrite a distinctively Canadian topography of curriculum theory, “one that begins at home but journeys elsewhere” (p. 148). In *A Topography For Canadian Curriculum Theory*, she called upon curriculum scholars to attune ourselves to the timbre and colour of where we were theorizing from and to experiment with the aesthetic and intellectual ways in which we labour to produce and narrate the dramatic stories that distinctively inhabit (or are exiled from) our field of study (or from curriculum policy documents across Canada). In this initial and ground breaking intellectual study of our field, and in relation to her experiences growing up in the north, or later travelling across Canada, Chambers looked to speculative fiction to generate some common topographic characteristics—survival, the alienated outsider, colonialism and our tenuous relations to the land—that could be juxtaposed as counterpoints echoed in radio documentaries like *The Idea of the North*, and/or *The Idea of Canada*, and more recently in literary novels like *Indian Horse*, *Three Day Road* and *Late Nights on Air*, or filmic interpretations of books like *The Lesser Blessed*.

Republished in Gibson’s (2012) anthology *Canadian Curriculum Studies: Trends, Issues, and Influences* this essay continues to provoke curriculum scholars, administrators, and graduate students in courses like an *Introduction to Curriculum Studies* to ask:

1. How are we experimenting with tools from different Canadian intellectual traditions and incorporating them into our theorizing?
2. What kinds of languages and interpretive tools have we created to study what we know and where we want to go?
3. In what ways have, and are, curriculum theorists writing in a detailed way the topos— the particular places and regions where we live and work?
4. How are these places inscribed in our theorizing, as either presence or absence, whether we want them there or not?

Indeed, these four questions invite us to challenge the discourse of “social efficiency” and the current push to hand over our re/conceptualizations of “curriculum” to multinational corporations, governmental technocrats, and/or to a Tylerian rationale (like our counterparts to the south) (Slattery, 2012). And yet, in grandiose terms, our hands in terms of influencing curriculum policy are often tied (Gidney, 2002; Pinto, 2012). More recently, Chambers (2012) has emphasized that our uncommon narrative countenance, in terms of our “inter-national” conceptions of curriculum, is that we are all treaty people—that the very foundation of what it means to be Canadian curriculum scholars is invoked in our historical and present treaty

relationships with the First Nation, Métis, and Inuit nations across Canada. But if Canada is constituted by First Nations within a nation, then what does revisiting such intellectual topographies mean for scholars who take up the very shifting tectonic “ideas” of Canadian curriculum studies that move beyond the classical philosophical studies of European antiquity firmly housed within the privileged universe of its academies? Can we? Do we need to shift our epistemological topographical navigations toward what Derrida (1991/1992) called *The Other Heading*?

Connected more than ever through social media Indigenous and non-Indigenous youth and elders are utilizing direct action to support First Nations civil rights movements like *Idle No More* through peaceful blockades, flash mob round dances, human rights and constitutional lawsuits, protests on parliament hill, and hunger strikes to educate the next generation of Canadians as well as their leaders. Such direct action is provoking some curriculum scholars, policy makers and the public to reconsider the existing mythologies that represent the enacted hidden curriculum that performs the semiotic symbolizations of our national identities as an institutional and psychic form of disavowed knowledge (Taubman, 2012), or the colonial frontier logics of Eurocentric neoliberal and or neoconservative discursive and material regimes (see Donald, 2009a, 2009b). Such civic movements remind Canadians that First Nation, Métis, and Inuit must first and foremost be recognized as sovereign nations living within and across the geopolitical territories we settlers call Canada. Several scholars have sought to address such present

absences in both provocative and productive curricular ways (Battiste, 2011; Chambers 2008, 2012; Cole, 2006; Dion & Dion, 2004; Donald 2004; Haig-Brown, 2008; Hasebe-Ludt, Chambers and Leggo, 2009; Kanu, 2011; Kulnieks, Longboat, & Young, 2013; Stanley and Young, 2011b; Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013; Weenie, 2008). Still, we need to pay more attention to the untold and unacknowledged histories, what Malewski & Jaramillo (2011) call elsewhere epistemologies of ignorance, whether that is in our intellectual work, developing curriculum policy documents, designing lesson and/or unit plans, and/or supporting school board priorities initiatives. Such intellectual absences and reluctant historical pilgrimages (Farley, 2009), toward learning more about what for some is the *"inconvenient Indian"* (King, 2012), I argue, is a threat to our collective historical consciousness not just for Canadian curriculum theorists, but also as civically engaged treaty peoples.

Post Y2K, curriculum scholars like Dennis Sumara, Brent Davis, and Linda Laidlaw (2001) invited us to reconsider the ways in which ecological and postmodern perspectives could provoke our taken-for-granted understandings of Canadian identities in relation to our curriculum theorizing. Their essay was inspired by a 1960s CBC contest, where Peter Gzowski the renowned host of the *Morningside* radio show, challenged the nation to complete the following adage: "As Canadian as . . ." The eventual winner was "As Canadian as possible under the circumstances" (Sumara, Davis, and Laidlaw, 2001, p. 21). Like Chambers (1999) before them, these authors offer interpretive postmodern and ecological speculations about the different ways our

history, popular mythologies, and conceptions of national identity inform our differing theoretical commitments. This article has too, since been, republished by Darren Stanley and Kelly Young's (2011a) in *Contemporary Studies in Canadian Curriculum: Principles, Portraits, & Practices*. The defining quality of Canada, as Sumara, Davis, and Laidlaw (2001) suggest, is in fact the lack thereof a "coherent" identity: Canadians tend to express an affinity for our diversity—of our people, climate, geography—as opposed to any essentialist attempt to define a particular identity. Today, postmodern and ecological perspectives continue to provide an epistemological framework for several Canadian curriculum scholars to analyze, challenge, interrupt, and synthesize neo-conservative-liberal-positivist—unified, logical, and totalized—narrative conceptions of reality (see Davis & Sumara, 2008a, 2008b; Stanley & Young, 2011b; Trifonas, 2004, 2006). The question of Canadian identity at that time, as these authors made clear, seemed to demonstrate only one point of agreement: while we cannot say for sure what we are, we will readily define ourselves by what we are not, specifically by distinguishing ourselves from the nationalist "melting-pot" and "imperialistic" idealizations we ascribe to the United States.

However, whether we like it or not, several colonial scars still haunt our collective historical consciousness (the Chinese head tax, the residential schooling system, segregated hospitals, medical, cultural, and nutritional experimentations on Aboriginal children, internment of Japanese Canadians, the refusal of entry to Jewish refugees during WWII, and ongoing lack of equitable funding to both on- and off-reserve

Aboriginal youth). Moreover in terms of how our governments have recently positioned themselves internationally (in Afghanistan, China, European Union, Iran, Libya, Mali, or Syria), nationally (through budgetary omnibus bills like C-45, First Nation Education Act), and provincially (like bill 115-Putting Students First Act in Ontario) over the last ten years, I'm not sure "We" can distinguish ourselves as easily (of what we are not) through traditional projections of our anti-American idealizations (Pinar, 2011). In many ways our country, and for better or worse our national narratives, have become projections of what in the past is lacking in an imagined foreign settler postcolony (see Farley 2008; Montgomery, 2005; Ng-A-Fook, 2011b; Stanley 2011). "Our" country, its diversified topographies, and the respective narratives "we" tell (or don't tell) each other remain deeply fragmented, situated, and partial—and again, could they be otherwise. One only has to turn on the television and watch the electoral debates now taking place in Québec—a *lament for a nation*, indeed. This very "idea" of our provincialized nation supports what scholars like Sumara, Davis, and Laidlaw (2001) have called a postmodern sensibility toward theorizing and representing diverse cultural, historical, social, political, psychic, performative, aesthetic and discursive constructions of our hyphenated national identities within the broader field of Canadian curriculum studies. And yet, certain settler narratives, the canonical fodder of their intellectual genealogies, still overshadow the provincial school curricula (see Den Heyer & Abbott, 2011; Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013; Tupper & Cappello, 2008).

Despite the looming (neocolonial) narrative monologue of the provincial school curricula, whether that is here in Ontario or elsewhere, in 1971 Canada sought to confirm its place in the world as a cosmopolitan society by incorporating multicultural policies into federal legislation. Our national government, as Ghosh and Abdi (2004) remind us, has since built upon early multicultural policies by further integrating its initial tenets into the Canadian Human Rights Act (1977), the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982), and the Multicultural Act (1988). Even though Canada was one of the first countries to create and implement such socially “progressive” national policies, as myself and others have outlined elsewhere (see Ng-A-Fook, Radford, & Ausman, 2012; Joshee & Sinfield, 2010), their implementation has been fraught with political conflicts related to how different cultures are perceived and served by our differing governing political parties and their respective neo-liberal and/or neo-conservative ideologies and economic immigration policies toward temporary foreign workers (Coloma, 2008, 2009, 2012; Pinto, 2012; Smith, 2003, 2011). The hotly debated and divisive *Charter of Values* in Québec and its rewriting (re/righting) of the history curriculum is another recent example (Curtis, 2013; Either, Cardin, & Lefrançois, 2013). Despite such ongoing politically enacted limit-situations (Freire, 1970/1990), first generation immigrants continue to make their migrations across the oceans from other lands to access the potential economic and social promise of what now constitutes the provinces and (unceded) territories of Canada. Indeed, the very “idea” of enacting our Canadian constitution is still promising. Student bodies

in urban classrooms are now represented by subjectivities with transnational citizenships performing multicultural and multilingual hyphenated identities (see Ibrahim, 2008a, 2008b; Ng-A-Fook, 2009).

Curriculum scholars like Ted Aoki (1992/2005) who experienced the material, political, and psychic violence of Canada's racialized policies of displacement and segregation invited policymakers, administrators, and teachers to think about how they could collectively be more "supportive of an understanding of Canada as a multiplicity of cultures, particularly as a counterpoint whenever the dominant majority cultures become indifferent to Canada's minorities" (p. 268). As with Aoki, others continue to invite us to revisit the concept of multiculturalism as a polyphony of lines of movement that grow in the abundance of conjunctive middles, the "betweens," or the doubling of cosmopolitan "hyph-e-nations" that some first generation immigrant youth continue to experience as "third spaces" within the contexts of public schooling (Ausman, 2011; Lewkowich, 2009, 2012; Pinar, 2009; Johnston & Richardson, 2012; Ng-A-Fook, Radford, Ausman, 2012; Watt, 2011). And yet, regardless of such debates, the abundance of different contextual meanings reminds us that normative, performative, material, and psychic notions of "nation" and "multiculturalism" are perpetually shifting and often tremble ontologically with postmodern uncertainty when we utter their names in relation to provoking questions about the very "idea" of Canadian curriculum studies.

In spite of our tendency to lapse into popular stereotypes like watching Don Cherry and Ron Mclean on *Coaches Corner*, singing

Stomping Tom's hockey song, listening to Jian Ghomeshi on *Q* or *Canada Reads*, Sook-Yin Lee on *Definitely Not the Opera* (or better known to her listeners as DNTO), idling at the drive-through for coffee at Tim Hortons, eating Beaver Tails on the Rideau Canal, or performing an apologetic sensibility... "Sorry, Eh!" while watching a racialized satirical beer commercial and shouting *I am Canadian* (as a celebratory performance of hypermasculinity)... Sumara, Davis, and Laidlaw (2001) suggest, that our theorizing remains deeply inspired by the concept of "place." And maybe these are just my stereotypical Canadian—strange brewed—fantasies. Nonetheless, our distinctive, and often harsh northern landscapes, have provided us with an appreciation of the importance of place—with a type of "ecological sensibility," if you will—despite our economic reliance on black gold or promise of discovering, to quote Gollum, "precious" treasures hidden within the northern Ontario *Ring of Fire*.

Our imagined nationalized identities and the respective narratives we tell ourselves as "Canadians" are expressed differently in different places and among our differing communities. This is perhaps *The Nature of Things*. In turn, as Sumara, Davis, and Laidlaw suggested now more than a decade ago, we readily distinguish ourselves based on our regional understandings of place and their particular histories, languages and cultures. These authors thus asserted then, that the vocabulary of ecological postmodernism perspectives affords us opportunities for the creation of an interpretive perspective or "useful fictions" with which to represent the relationships among Canada's "history, memory, language,

and geography," and their contributions to our individual, national, and intellectual identities (p. 159). Their essay is also a cautious reminder, however, in an era of internationalizing (and corporatizing, computerizing, digitalizing, and so on) our educational institutions, that the interpretation and enactment of curriculum is always inherently rooted (routed) or imagined through our lived experiences of local geographies in relation to the current cosmopolitan psychic and material realities of the 21st century.

Regardless of the admitted romantic and nostalgic limit-situations of writing autobiographically in relation to "place," to the north (Chambers, 2006; Smits, 2008), an emphasis on "place" and our "relationships" to it, continues to be prominent within the Canadian field of curriculum studies (see Blood, Chambers, Donald, Hasebe-Ludt, & Big Head, 2012), where scholars often perform a particular interest in provoking hidden (or more ethical) relations among the objects, people, and the content of their inquiries (see Donald, 2004, 2012; Lund, Panayotidis, Smits, and Towers, 2006; Naqvi and Smits, 2012; Trifonas, 2008). What becomes clear then in terms of surveying our past, at least for me, is that several Canadian curriculum scholars continue to theorize, develop, and mobilize research that engages the recursive and refractive processes of weaving together both theoretically and pedagogically our (ethical and affective) relationships with the many differing geographies, climates, cultures, ethnicities, languages, and narratives. In many ways these scholars have been able to foster an inclusive conversation that in turn enables what Miller (2014) calls "communities without consensus" to

gather, share ideas, and listen together, in spite of our disciplinary differences. Moreover a survey of the field, illustrates, that Canadian curriculum scholars have indeed paid particular attention to the past and worked to reconceptualize our understandings of “curriculum,” its coursings, its narrative eddies, away, against, with, and beyond the imperial and generative epistemological and philosophically apologetic sign postings of antiquity.

Mobilizing Canadian Curriculum Research Beyond Crossroads

The sharing of horizons within communities of difference helps break down the dichotomy between the private and public spheres, and may serve as a kind of prelude to a theory of justice that honours difference while holding every difference accountable to its influence in the public realm.

(Smith, 2003, p. 47)

If that be so, although my suffering is always uniquely in a story in which I am the seeming narrator, it is never mine alone but always ours.

(Aoki, 1996/2005, p. 410)

In 2008, like other nations, Canada suffered “a financial perfect storm of a sputtering U.S economy, tumbling oil prices and falling domestic demand that conspired to hurt the country’s growth prospects” (CBC

News, 2008). Over the last decade Canadians have witnessed the demise and reformation of several political parties (Federal and provincial Conservative, Liberal, National Democratic, and Green Parties) and multinational corporations (like *Nortel* and *Research in Motion* with its in/famous *Blackberry*). Although our economy was able to recover relatively "unscathed" from the 2008 global debt crisis (or so the political rhetoric goes), public and private sectors have seen their wages frozen or even cut through the rhetoric of institutional efficiency (an increased workload for university professors and wage freeze for public school teachers) and/or government austerity measures (cuts to several social services and research funding programs in the name of falling crude oil prices like in Alberta).

Meanwhile, our "peace" diamonds, gold, "clean" oil sands, phosphate, potash, uranium, asbestos, or refurbishing and building hydro dams in the West, North and out East, continue to be the driving force of our national economy—a *beautiful destruction* indeed.^{ix} Internally, Canada experienced (is experiencing) one of the largest migrations of citizens from our eastern provinces like Prince Edward Island or Newfoundland to northern Alberta who in turn are prospecting for the economic promises of extracting black gold (or ethical oil for those who like to spin the tentacles of capitalism discursively) in prosperous rural towns and cities like Lloydminster and Fort McMurray.

Provincial organizations like the Ontario Curriculum Council have created several different educational reports and policies in response to the increasing multicultural and multinational diversity present in

classrooms all in the name of character development, social cohesion and economic prosperity for the 21st century (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2008, 2009, 2010). Despite the potential innovations of such economic oil booms and educational policies, Canadians now owe at least on average \$1.65 for every dollar that they earn (Grant, 2012). The Alberta government recently announced that it is attempting to manage a multibillion-dollar deficit. At the same time banks are producing record profits through higher and higher service fees as Canadian families and individuals take on more and more household debt. Is this a new form of taxation on the knowledge economy workforce by high-tech hipsters and the well-established economic landlords of banking? Heeding the words of Atwood (1972, 2008) now forty years later, what is the future cost of intergenerational survival, for paying back our growing debt? Is this in/deed in her words... the dark side of wealth?

Our federal government, with tongue and cheek, critiques the mismanagement of funding by band councils on northern Ontario First Nation reserves like Attawapiskat, while their children learn and live the hard realities of broken negotiated treaty promises in schools situated just above the surface of the economic leftover effluents leached into the landscape by multinational corporations. Below the Senate, and its scandalous rhetoric of affluenza, mosquito advocates like Cindy Blackstock (in-press, 2012), and local elementary school teachers and students here in the capital region, continue to ask themselves what they need to do as citizens to realize *Jordan's Principle* and/or *Shannen's Dream*. How many Canadian citizens know how this contemporary

circumstance can be traced back to our failure to respect prior agreements put forth in the *Royal Proclamation* of 1763. Such historical disavowed knowledge is the threat of grandiose neo-lib-con-colonial conceptions of contemporaneity in relation to government (curriculum) policies. And scholars like Aparna Mishra Tarc, Cynthia Chambers, Claudia Eppert, Celia Haig-Brown, David G. Smith, Dwayne Donald, Hans Smits, Jennifer Tupper, Lisa Farley, Roger Simon, and Susan Dion just to name a few, have travelled the historical and discursive topographies of disavowed knowledges and epistemological ignorance to illuminate such ongoing grandiose neo/colonial threats.

The institutional winds (political, economic, cultural, and so on) that once supported traditional organizational frameworks for public education have shifted to meet the demands of our current digital knowledge economy here in Canada (Brushwood Rose, 2006; Jenson & Brushwood Rose, 2007; Corrigan, Ng-A-Fook, Levesque, & Smith, 2013). In response, teacher education programs and school boards across our nation have rewired the infrastructure of public education and are now poised to implement different forms and practices of curricular programs in the name of economic and social innovation for the 21st century (see Clifford, Friesen, Lock, 2004; Friesen & Jardine, 2009). Now the curriculum must be hardwired for Smartphones, iPads, iPods, and so on—where teachers and students' bodies are plugged-in more readily to the corporate and social *Matrix* of YouTube, Google Cloud, Microsoft 365, and Facebook—myself included of course. In order to understand and further advance the technological bio-power of this newly established

Matrix, the Canadian government has restructured its funding priorities for research in the social sciences and humanities (Social Sciences and the Humanities Council for Research, 2013). In light of these technological and social innovations, our tasks as Canadian curriculum theorists are increasingly subject to these newly established discursive and material matrices. Therefore with such macro and micro shifting contexts in mind, what kinds of curricular questions do we want to, or *ought* to as Smits (2008) suggests, ask and mobilize in the name of Canadian curriculum studies?

Organizations like the *Canadian Association of Curriculum Studies* (CACS) continue to be a hub for our community to ask more of our research in response to such inter-national economic, social, and technological “innovations.” In 1973, our association became one of the first members of the *Canadian Society for the Study of Education* (Allard et. al., 1999). This organizational consortium of *Learned Societies* is in many ways our national equivalent of the *American Association of Education Research* (AERA). Since 2002 elected presidents mostly from British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario have stewarded our organization (Celia Haig-Brown, Rita Irwin, Denise Sumara, Hans Smits, Ingrid Johnston, Karen Krasny, Nicholas Ng-A-Fook and Rochelle Skogen, and now Erika Hasebe-Ludt and Robert Nellis). The current leadership team (comprised also of Aparna Mishra Tarc, Teresa Strong-Wilson, Avril Aitken, and Linda Radford) is working to update our constitution in terms of its mandate, executive positions, and relationship with the journal. Moreover CACS has revamped its website and social networking

infrastructure (see <http://www.csse-scee.ca/cacs/>), in order to better represent and mobilize its members' research to local, national, and international audiences. Diane Watt along with several graduate students like Bryan Smith, Cristyne Hebert, Heather Phipps, Amarou Yoder, and Tasha Ausman are creating, supporting, and disseminating our members' scholarship and their service to the Canadian public. However, as we look to the future my sense is (now as an acting past co-president with Rochelle Skogen) that we still need to reach out more to our colleagues in Quebec, the Maritime Provinces, and northern Territories, as well as collaborate on more events and research projects with professional organizations like the *Canadian Association for the Study of Indigenous Education* (CASIE) here in Canada, or the *International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies* (IAACS) whose conference will be hosted at the University of Ottawa in 2015.

For the past few years CACS continues to be the largest association affiliated with CSSE. In turn, our association has several affiliated Special Interest Groups (SIGs): Arts Researchers and Teachers (ARTS), Canadian Critical Pedagogy Association (CCPA), Language and Literacy Researchers of Canada (LLRC), Regroupement pour l'étude de l'éducation en milieu minoritaire francophone, and Science Education Research Group (SERG). Each year CSSE hosts a national conference where our association and affiliated SIGs gather to provoke the very ideas that constitute (or for some don't) Canadian curriculum studies during that temporal moment. Subsequently, several differing disciplinary intellectual traditions and interests continue to strategically

stitch our association together. If JCACS then, does indeed represent the members of these differing SIGS, it would seem plausible that several differing disciplinary conceptual frameworks and methodologies might be represented in its past issues and continue to participate in the future re/conceptualizations of the cultural, psychic, material, political, and so on concept we call “curriculum.” Such potential for interdisciplinary participation has been one of the strengths of our association in terms of its constitution, journal, and scholarship rather than a threat to the viability of “complex coherence” within our broader community. By establishing defined boundaries, will this not create the same kinds of exclusion that the editors experienced at the epistemological and discursive hands of *the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies* call for papers? But what then constitutes curriculum theorizing for Canadian scholars? Should anything go? Does the word “curriculum” need to present itself as the focal point of our conference and journalistic conversations? And if it does, who then gets to decide the linguistic, disciplinary, epistemological, and so on boundaries, of what the lived concept “curriculum” inside and outside of them, should mean?

In 2003, Dennis Sumara and Rebecca Luce-Kapler published the first issue of the *Journal of the Canadian Association of Curriculum Studies*. Initially, this online journal was created to showcase the intellectual work of members associated with CACS. And by all accounts, my sense is, that it still does. The first issue, *Inventing New Vocabularies for Curriculum Studies in Canada*, was inspired by a call for scholars to share

"crazy ideas" that interrupted commonsense habits of mind during the 2002 CACS President's symposium at CSSE. In its introduction, the authors outlined the following intellectual framework of the journal: *Curriculum Genealogies*, *Curriculum Lives*, *Curriculum Forum*, and *Curriculum Pedagogies*. Drawing on the work of Foucault, the section titled *Curriculum Genealogies* was established to "remind ourselves and readers that inquiries into the relationship between past and current events is always a critical interpretive practice that aims to discern the ways in which particular discourses constitute the objects, practices, and/or subjects that are available for study" (Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 2003, p. 2). The recent works of Smits (2008), Stanley and Young (2011a), Ng-A-Fook and Rottmann (2012), Gibson (2012), Chambers, Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, and Sinner (2012), Christou (2012), as well as Hurren and Hasebe-Ludt (2014), represent an ongoing commitment to further researching, contemplating, and sharing our intellectual genealogies.

The journal also created a featured section titled *Curriculum Lives*, where the biographies and insights into Canadian curriculum scholars lives are shared as well as innovations within autobiographical research (see Chambers, 2004a; Johnston & Richardson, 2012; Lewkowich, 2011; Pinar, 2008c; Weber & Mitchell, 2003). In addition to featuring essays presented during the CACS Presidential Address, *Curriculum Forum* and *Curriculum Pedagogies* made up the final featured sections of the first issue of JCACS. *Curriculum Forum* afforded scholars opportunities to ask and respond to critical questions and issues raised within our field of study (Cherubini, 2009; Haig-Brown, 2008; Nellis, 2005; Pinar 2008b;

Pinto and Coulson, 2011; Smits 2008). Whereas *Curriculum Pedagogies*, enabled scholars and/or graduate students to share short essays that described undergraduate and graduate curriculum studies courses being taught at different universities across Canada (Aitken & Radford, 2012; Kanu & Glor, 2006; Matthews, 2009; Radford, 2009; Lloyd, 2012b).

Since its inception, 11 issues and over 100 articles authored by scholars working at Canadian universities have been successfully published under the stewardship of different editors in chief (Dennis Sumara, Rebecca Luce-Kapler, and Rena Upitis 2003-2007, Karen Krasny and Chloe Brushwood Rose 2008-2012, and now Theodore Christou and Christopher DeLuca). This open access journal remains a key online repository for those wanting to learn more about the intellectual history and innovations (like the *affective* turn, see Brushwood Rose and Krasny, 2013) taking place within Canadian curriculum studies (Corrigan & Ng-A-Fook, 2012). Although I have made reference to a few examples in this conversation, I encourage readers to take the time to visit the archives of this journal and learn more about the innovations (crazy/innovative/provocative ideas) taking place within curriculum research across Canada. The new editors are in the midst of making some innovative and exciting changes to the journal. However we need to do more to encourage graduate students and colleagues to register as online readers. This could easily be part of a course syllabus that focuses (or does not) on curriculum studies. In turn, the commitment of an increasing membership of the journal will support the new editors as they endeavour to secure funding from agencies like the *Social Sciences*

and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). Moreover it will provide a site for upcoming scholars to learn not only about our collective intellectual genealogy, but also opportunities to contribute to the already existing complicated conversation represented within it.

Over the last decade Canadian curriculum scholars have negotiated the different research priorities put forth by the Federal government. Many curriculum scholars (if they are lucky) receive internal and external funding from their universities, provincial ministries of education, and/or Federal funding agencies like SSHRC or Ministry of Education contracts. Others live, either by choice, or due to institutional sponsored exclusion, as alienated outsiders at the margins of such governmental regimes. At both the provincial and federal levels of government, there has been a push to encourage Canadian researchers to refocus our research strategies on producing insights and mobilizing research to international, national and provincial communities.^x Federal agencies like SSHRC have established the following priority areas for funding: 1) Aboriginal Research; 2) Canadian Environment; 3) Digital Economy; 4) Innovation, Leadership, and Prosperity; and 5) Northern Communities: Towards Social and Economic Prosperity.

Historically, our CACS leadership worked to contest the utilitarian politics of science. In 1985, “Ted Aoki (University of Alberta), Michael Connelly (OISE), Roger Simon (OISE), and Walter Werner (University of British Columbia)—objected to certain language in SSHRC guidelines to adjudicators, particularly words like ‘scientific’ and ‘generalizability,’ which, in their view” perpetuated “an anti-qualitative bias” (Allard, et.

al., 1999, p. 74). However, as we well know, under the current governmental regime, even scientists themselves must now offer Socratic apologies, protesting on parliament's front steps, to secure funding for projects that do not comply with the utilitarian dream of economic prosperity—like the science that supports our concerns about the future intergenerational impacts due to climate change. Therefore very few international and national curriculum scholars have been able to secure these competitive grants and/or Canadian Research Chairs in order to ask more of Canadian curriculum studies in relation to “crazy ideas.”^{xi} Despite the difficulty with securing funding, several Canadian curriculum scholars continue to travel to international conferences hosted by the *American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, the *International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, *Curriculum and Pedagogy*, as well as *Bergamo* (Curriculum Theory and Classroom Practice).

In 2010, a special issue of *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, titled *Life Writing Across Knowledge Traditions*, and edited by Erika Hasebe-Ludt & Nané Jordan consisted of articles composed by Canadian curriculum scholars. This special issue sought to make the current cutting edge work on life writing taking place in Canada available to international curriculum scholars. Our community has also historically imported several theoretical concepts from the scholarship of American, African, Australian, European, and South American Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars into the work we do here at home (see works of Britzman, 1998, 2006, 2009; Chambers, 2003; Kanu, 2009; and Ng-A-Fook,

2009, 2011a; Pinar, 2008a, 2008b, 2013 as some examples).^{xii} As we look toward future horizons, what kinds of questions will curriculum scholars across the different topographies of Canadian curriculum theory ask (and challenge) of such imported theoretical concepts and national priority areas in relation to our differing epistemological stances, while also questioning the ontological differences of our curriculum theorizing, in terms of their potential influence within the public realm? How might we draw upon the historical and contemporary concepts put forth by our colleagues, whether they are internationally imported and/or homegrown, to provoke questions of what the very "idea" of Canadian curriculum studies "ought to" be, as possible as they may be, under the present circumstances? With such questions in mind, let us briefly return to the threats put forth in *Curriculum Studies at a Crossroad: Curating Inclusive and Coherent Curriculum Conversations* in Canada.

Living within Canadian Curriculum Studies as a Complicated Conversation

I am indeed a northern listener... In detaching and in reflecting and in listening, I suppose I am able to synthesize, to have these different rails meet in the infinity that is our conscious hope.

(Wally V. Maclean, 1967)

Fields, just like schools, are comprised of people, people with ideas.

(Pinar et. al., 1995, p. 4)

The term *curriculum* is many things to many people.

(Aoki, 1980/2005, p. 94)

Being open, paying attention, and not knowing, that is, presuming as little as possible about others, is a deeply respectful way of relating.

(Oberg, 2004b, p. 242)

I am indeed a curriculum listener. And like the editors, and Wally V. Maclean, my conscious hope is that our field will remain a lively and inclusive conversational site for us to complicate the very “idea” of “curriculum” well into the future. In part, to do so, as the editors acknowledge, and Pinar (2006) before them, Canadian curriculum scholars must not only continue to pay attention to the historical and contemporary “interdisciplinary reconfigurations of the intellectual contexts of curriculum,” but also do the necessary scholarly work of documenting the related conversations, as complicated or incoherent as they may appear to be (p. 2). Although more and differing interpretations are needed, scholars like Tomkins, Chambers, Sumara, Laidlaw, Davis, Haig-Brown, Smits, and others at one point, or another, have taken up the pedagogical and intellectual task of surveying and narrating the complex provincialized topographies that make up the field of Canadian curriculum studies.

Moreover, what this recent survey makes clear, at least for me, is that

such curriculum scholars, and others elsewhere, like our strong poets, dancers, flutists, painters, (digital) storytellers, curriculum designers, historians, social activists, critical pedagogues, interdisciplinary theorists of psychoanalysis, phenomenology, postcolonial, Indigenous, gender, race, sexuality, youth studies, and so on, have been and are committed toward "interpreting ourselves within the broader context of life and our relationships with others, with our environment, and with the broader world of ideas, past, present, and future" (Christou & DeLuca, 2013, p. 13). Since Y2K, several Canadian curriculum scholars like the life writing group at Lethbridge (<http://www.lifewriting.ca/lifewriters/>), or A/r/tography at UBC (<http://artography.edcp.educ.ubc.ca/>), have developed innovative, aesthetically creative, and rigorous research methodologies for creating and sharing the discursive and aesthetic complexity of such conversations without devolving our discourse into "a relatively foggy, often obtuse, and exclusive discursive exercise" (p. 13). Like Gould's experimentations with counterpointed compositions, these scholars have sought to create and represent our historical and contemporary narratives as rapprochements and juxtapositions—a literary métissage "between alternative and mainstream curriculum discourses" as an ethos of our times (Hasebe-Ludt, Chambers, Leggo, 2009, p. 11). Indeed, these scholars and others have spent considerable time developing, advocating, and *living out loud* the aesthetic, political, and interpretive rigor of life writing, its *currere*, as enriching theoretical frameworks and research methodologies.

Our field then, is gifted with the presence of scholars who bring

differing innovative theoretical and methodological ideas for us to listen to, reflect on, and synthesize in relation to our research methodologies, our theorizing, and in our praxis where the term “curriculum” still remains many things to many people. Our community of scholars and their “crazy” ideas is what comprises the distinct field of Canadian curriculum studies. Might we then continue to be open and pay attention, to live well together as a community without consensus, while discussing what “curriculum” is at this time and place. And yet, continue to reread and reinterpret the present absences within such historical and contemporary conversations reflectively, recursively, and in a respectful way of relating to one another, while provoking and contemplating the very “idea” of Canadian curriculum studies as an ever evolving alliterated, aesthetic, complicated, contested, counterpointed, composition.

Notes

ⁱ This essay initially began with a generous invitation. More than a year ago William F. Pinar, my mentor, colleague, and dear friend invited me to submit a manuscript on the state of Canadian curriculum studies for the second edition of *The Internationalization Handbook of Curriculum Research*. Unfortunately, and apologetically, I was not able to complete this essay on time for its eventual release due to the complexity of this specific writing composition. Regardless, I would like to thank Bill for encouraging me to take on this curriculum theory project and for his ongoing support as a colleague and friend. I would also like to thank Bryan Smith, Cristyne Hebert, Aparna Mishra Tarc and Linda Radford for taking the time to read several drafts and offer important editorial

feedback prior to its submission. This project could not have come to fruition without the assistance of Rita Forte, a Ph.D. candidate here at our Faculty of Education, who tracked down and compiled the various Canadian curriculum scholars' works into a digital annotated database. I hope to work through this database and publish a more comprehensive book that seeks to further understand the intellectual histories that comprise our field of study. Finally, this complicated curriculum conversation would not have come to fruition without the generous support of the current JCACS editors Ted Christou and Chris DeLuca who created a space for it to have a forum and a home.

ⁱⁱ For more on Glenn Gould's life and work consult the following websites:

- 1) <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/emc/glenn-gould/>;
- 2) <http://www.cbc.ca/player/Radio/More+Shows/Glenn+Gould+-+The+CBC+Legacy/Audio/1960s/ID/2110447480/>;
- 3) <http://glenn Gould.ca/articles/2010/10/18/examining-the-new-counterpoint-goulds-contrapuntal-radio.html>. (Retrieved on December 15, 2012)

ⁱⁱⁱ To listen to this radio program see

<http://www.cbc.ca/player/Radio/Living+Out+Loud/ID/2274814355/?page=3>.

^{iv} During the 1980s and 1990s the Quebec provincial government held referendums on whether or not to secede from the rest of Canada. In 1990 the Canadian government was forced to mobilize its military to settle a land dispute between the Mohawk First Nation community and non-indigenous settlers of the town of Oka, Quebec. One person died during this crisis. This was the first well-publicized violent conflict between a First Nation community and the federal government during the second half of the 20th century.

^v Here verticality is, as Pinar (2007) explains, the historical and intellectual topography of a discipline. Whereas horizontality, he suggests, refers to analyses of present circumstances, both in terms of

internal intellectual trends, as well as in terms of the external social and political milieus influencing the international field of curriculum studies. Studying the verticality and horizontality of such interdisciplinary topographies, as Pinar (2007) makes clear, affords us a unique opportunity to understand a series of scholarly moves both outside and within (as a form of wayfinding) what Chambers (1999, 2006) has called the topos of Canadian curriculum studies.

^{vi} For scholars seeking to find comprehensive texts that include some of the different historical and contemporary works of Canadian curriculum scholars like Rahat Naqvi and Hans Smits (2012), Cynthia Chambers, Erica Hasebe-Ludt, Carl Leggo, and Anita Sinner (2012), Susan Gibson (2012), James Nahachewsky and Ingrid Johnston, (2009), Nicholas Ng-A-Fook & Jennifer Rottmann (2012), Stephanie Springgay and Deborah Freedman (2012), and Darren Stanley & Kelly Young (2011a).

^{vii} The following scholars have put forth key theoretical concepts for future curriculum scholars to reread and write our intellectual history: Ted Aoki (1973, 1983), Marie Battiste (2002, 2011), Cynthia Chambers (2004, 2006, 2012), Ken Den Heyer and Lawrence Abbott (2011), Susan D. Dion (2004), Celia Haig-Brown (2001, 2008), David Smith (2003, 2006, 2009), Dwayne Donald (2004, 2009a), Jennifer Tupper and Cappello (2008), Lisa Farley (2008, 2009, 2010), Yattu Kanu (2003, 2009, 2011), Roland Santos Coloma (2012), Timothy Stanley (2012), and Angelina Weenie (2008).

^{viii} To learn more about curriculum scholars who have either critiqued our field of study in an attempt to create shifts in terms of our theorizing and/or the aesthetic ways in which we have sought to represent our content textually and/or performatively see the works of Robin Barrow (1979), Kieran Egan, (1996, 2003), Jennifer Gilbert (2006), Wanda Hurren and Erica Hasebe-Ludt, (2011), David Jardine (2006, 2008a, 2008b), Antoinette Oberg (2004a, 2004b), Geoffrey Milburn and John Herbert (1974), Ken Osborne (1982), Morawski & Palulis (2009), Rita Irwin (2003, 2004, 2006), Carl Leggo (2004, 2007, 2010, 2011), Celeste Snowber (1999, 2002), Celeste Snowber and Sean Wiebe (2011), Aparna Mishra Tarc

(2011a, 2011b), Sameshima & Leggo (2013), and Stephanie Springgay (2005, 2011).

^{ix} See part of Louis Helbig's *A Beautiful Destruction* exhibit at <http://www.beautifuldestruction.ca/>. The exhibit is a collection of aerial photos taken from his 1940s plane of the Alberta oil sands.

^x In Ontario the Ministry of Education has sought to do that by establishing Knowledge Network for Applied Education Research (KNAER) (see http://www.knaer-recrae.ca/home_en.html).

^{xi} For some examples of curriculum research supported by SSHRC see the publication of Hasebe-Ludt, Chambers, and Leggo's (2009) study: *Rewriting Literacy Curriculum in Canadian Cosmopolitan Schools*. Or, Cynthia Chambers study: *What is literacy, and what does it mean, from a contemporary Inuit perspective?* Or, Judith Robertson's (2010) study *Saltwater Chronicles*. In 2012, William F. Pinar renewed his Canada Research Chair at the University of British Columbia and received 1.4 million dollars to support his research in curriculum studies from the Canadian federal government.

^{xii} Some of the international curriculum scholars who continue to influence my intellectual work William Doll Jr. (1993, 2006, 2008), Madeleine Grumet, (1987, 1988), Janet Miller, (2004, 2014), Petra Munro (1998a, 1998b), William F. Pinar, (2004) from the United States, Noel Gough (2007a, 2007b, 2008,) from Australia, and Linda T. Smith (1999) from New Zealand, just to name some examples.

References

- Aitken, A. & Radford, L. (2012). Aesthetic archives: Pre-Service teachers symbolizing experiences through digital storytelling. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 10(2), 92–119.
- Allard, M., Covert, J., Dufresne-Tasse, C., Hildyard, A., & Jackson, M. (1999). *A challenge met: The definition and recognition of the field of education*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Society for the Study of Education.
- Aoki, T. T. (1973). Toward devolution in the control of education on a Native reserve in Alberta: The Hobbema curriculum story. *Council on anthropology and education newsletter*, 4(3), 1–6.
- Aoki, T. T. (1977). Theoretic dimensions of curriculum: Reflections from a micro-perspective. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 2(1), 49–56.
- Aoki, T. T. (1980/2005). Toward curriculum in a new key. In W. F. Pinar & R. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a New Key*, (pp. 89–110). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Aoki, T. T. (1983). Experiencing ethnicity as a Japanese Canadian teacher: Reflections on a personal curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 13(3), 321–335.
- Aoki, T. T. (1992/2005). In the midst of slippery theme-words: Living as designers of Japanese Canadian curriculum. In W. F. Pinar & R. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a New Key*, (pp. 263–278). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Aoki, T. T. (1996/2005). Narrative and narration in curricular spaces. In W. F. Pinar & R. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a New Key*, (pp. 403–411). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Aoki, T. T. (2005). Postscript/rescript. In W. F. Pinar & R. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a New Key*, (pp. 449–457). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Atwood, M. (1972). *Survival: A thematic guide to Canadian literature*. Toronto, ON: Anansi.
- Atwood, M. (2008). *Payback: debt and the shadow side of wealth*. Toronto, ON: Anansi.
- Ausman, T. (2011). A curriculum of cultural translation: Desi identities in American chai. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, 8(2), 22–39.
- Barrow, R. (1979). *The Canadian curriculum: A personal view*. London, ON: University of Western Ontario.
- Battiste, M. (2002). *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.
- Battiste, M. (2011). Curriculum reform through constitutional reconciliation of Indigenous knowledge. In D. Stanley & K. Young (Eds.), *Contemporary Studies in Canadian Curriculum: Principles, Portraits, & Practices*, (pp. 287–312). Calgary, AB: Detselig Enterprises LTD.
- Blackstock, C. (2012). *Jordan and Shannen: First Nations children demand that Canada stop racially discriminating against them*. Shadow report for Canada's 3rd and 4th periodic report to the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child. Ottawa, ON: First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada.

- Blackstock, C. (in-press). Mosquito advocacy: Change promotion strategies for small groups with big ideas. In Hilary Weaver (Ed.), *Social issues in contemporary Native America: Reflections from Turtle Island*. Surrey, UK: Ashgate.
- Blood, N., Chambers, C., Donald, D., Hasebe-Ludt, E., & Big Head, R. (2012). Aoksisowaato'op: Place and story as organic curriculum. In N. Ng-A-Fook & J. Rottmann (Eds.), *Reconsidering Canadian Curriculum Studies*, (pp. 47–82). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Britzman, D. (1998). *Lost subjects, contested objects*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Britzman, D. (2006). *Novel education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Britzman, D. (2009). *The very thought of education*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Brushwood Rose, C. (2006). Virtual curriculum: Digital games as technologies of aesthetic experience and potential spaces. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 4(1), 97–110.
- Canada Broadcast Corporation. (2008). Canada heading for recession, say economists. Retrieved on June 15, 2013 from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/business/story/2008/10/06/recession.html>
- Chambers, C. (1999). A topography for Canadian curriculum theory. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 24(2), 137–150.
- Chambers, C. (2003). 'As Canadian as possible under the circumstances': A view of contemporary curriculum discourses in Canada. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *The Internationalization Handbook of Curriculum Research*, (pp. 221–252). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Chambers, C. (2004a). Antoinette Oberg: A real teacher . . . and an organic but not so public intellectual... *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 2(1), 245–260.
- Chambers, C. (2004b). Research that matters: Finding a path with heart. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 2(1), 1–19.
- Chambers, C. (2006). 'Where do I belong?' Canadian curriculum as passport home. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 2, 1–18.
- Chambers, C. (2008). Where are we? Finding common ground in a curriculum of place. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 6(2), 113–128.
- Chambers, C. (2012). "We are all treaty people": The contemporary countenance of Canadian curriculum studies. In N. Ng-A-Fook & J. Rottmann (Eds.), *Reconsidering Canadian Curriculum Studies*, (pp. 23–38). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chambers, C., & Hasebe-Ludt, & Leggo, C., & Sinner, A. (2012). (Eds.). *A Heart of Wisdom: Life writing as empathetic inquiry*. New York, New York: Peter Lang.
- Cherubini, L. (2009). "Taking Haig-Brown seriously": Implications of Indigenous thought on Ontario educators. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 7(1), 6–23.
- Christou, T. M. (2012). *Progressive education: Revisioning and reframing Ontario's public schools 1919–1942*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

- Christou, T. M. & Deluca, C. (2013). Curriculum Studies at a Crossroad: Curating Inclusive and Coherent Curriculum Conversations in Canada. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 11(1), 13-22.
- Clifford, P., Friesen, S., & Lock, J. (2004). *Coming to teaching in the 21st century: A research study conducted by the Galileo educational network*. Retrieved from <http://www.galileo.org/research/publications/ctt.pdf>
- Cole, P. (2006). *Coyote raven go canoeing: Coming home to the village*. Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's Press.
- Coloma, R. S. (2008). All immigrants are Mexicans, only Blacks are minorities, but some of us are brave race, multiculturalism, and postcolonial studies. *U.S. Education Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 24(1), 32-46.
- Coloma, R. S. (2009). "Destiny has yhrown the Negro and the Filipino under the tutelage of America": Race and curriculum in the age of empire. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 39(4), 495-519.
- Coloma, R. S. (2012). Theorizing Asian Canada, reframing differences. In N. Ng-A-Fook & J. Rottmann (Eds.), *Reconsidering Canadian Curriculum Studies: Provoking Historical, Present, and Future Perspectives*, (pp. 119-136). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Corrigan, J. & Ng-A-Fook, N. (2012). Mobilizing curriculum studies in a (virtual) world: Open access, edupunks, and the public Good. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 35(2), 58-76.

- Corrigan, J., Ng-A-Fook, N., Levesque, S., & Smith, B. (2013). Looking to the future to understand the past: A survey of pre-service history teachers' experiences with digital technology and content knowledge. *Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy*, 1(2), 49–73.
- Curtis, B. (2013). Debate on the teaching of history: Historical epistemology meets nationalist narrative. *Historical Studies in Education*, 25(2), 115–128.
- Cushing, A. (2010). Examining the new counterpoint: Gould's contrapuntal radio. Retrieved on December 15, 2012. <http://glenn Gould.ca/articles/2010/10/18/examining-the-new-counterpoint-goulds-contrapuntal-radio.html>.
- Davis, B. & Sumara, D. (2008a). The death and life of great educational ideas: Why we might want to avoid a critical complexity theory. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 6(1), 163–176.
- Davis, B. & Sumara, D. (2008b). Complexity as a theory of education. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, 5(2), 33–44.
- Den Heyer, K & Abbott, L. (2011). Reverberating echoes: Challenging teacher candidates to tell and learn from entwined narrations of Canadian history. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 41(5), 610–635.
- Derrida, J. (1991/1992). *The other heading. Reflections on today's Europe* (P.A. Brault & M. B. Naas, Trans.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Dion, S. & Dion, M. (2004). The braiding histories stories. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 2(1), 77–100.

- Dion, S. (2004). (Re)telling to disrupt: Aboriginal people and stories of Canadian history. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 2(1), 55–76.
- Doll, W. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Doll, W. (2006). Method and its culture: An historical approach. *Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education*, 3(1), 85–89.
- Doll, W. (2008). Looking back to the future: A recursive retrospect. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 6(1), 3–20.
- Donald, D. (2004). Edmonton Pentimento: Re-reading history in the case of the Papaschase Cree. *Journal of Canadian Curriculum Studies*, 2(1), 21–54.
- Donald, D. (2009a). The curricular problem of indigenism: Colonial frontier logics, teacher resistances, and the acknowledgement of ethical space. In J. Nhachewsky & I. Johnston (Eds.), *Beyond "Presentism": Re-imagining the Historical, Personal, and Social Places of Curriculum*, (pp. 23–39). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Donald, D. (2009b). Forts, curriculum, and Indigenous métissage: Imagining decolonization of Aboriginal-Canadian relations in educational contexts. First Nations perspectives. *The Journal of the Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre*, 2(1), 1–24.
- Donald, D. (2012). Forts, curriculum, and ethical relationality. In N. Ng-A-Fook & J. Rottmann (Eds.), *Reconsidering Canadian curriculum studies* (pp. 39–46). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Doran, A. (Director). (2013). *The lesser blessed* [Motion picture]. United States: Monterey Media.
- Egan, K. (1996). Competing voices for the curriculum. In M. Wideen & M. C. Courtland (Eds.), *The Struggle for Curriculum: Education, the State, and the Corporate Sector*, (pp. 7–26). Burnaby, BC: Institute for Studies in Teacher Education.
- Egan, K. (2003). What is curriculum? *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 1(1), 9–16.
- Éthier, M.A., Cardin, J. F., & Lefrancois, D. (2013). Cris et chuchotements: la citoyenneté au Cœur de l'enseignement de l'histoire au Québec. *Revue d'histoire de l'éducation*, 25(2), 87–107.
- Farley, L. (2008). An Oedipus for our time: On the un-discipline of historical relations. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 24(1), 20–31.
- Farley, L. (2009). Radical hope: On the problem of uncertainty in history education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 39(4), 537–554.
- Farley, L. (2010). The reluctant pilgrim: Questioning belief after historical loss. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 8(1), 6–40.
- Freire, P. (1970/1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum Press.
- Friesen, S. & Jardine, D. (2009). *21st century learning and learners*. Western and Northern Canadian Curriculum Protocol. Retrieved from [http://education.alberta.ca/media/1087278/wncp%2021st%20cent%20learning%20\(2\).pdf](http://education.alberta.ca/media/1087278/wncp%2021st%20cent%20learning%20(2).pdf).

- Gibson, S. (Ed.) (2012). *Canadian curriculum studies: Trends, issues, and influences*. Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Gidney, R. D. (1999). *From hope to Harris: The reshaping of Ontario's schools*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Gilbert, J. (2006). "Let us say yes to who or what turns up": Education as hospitality. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 4(1), 25–34.
- Ghosh, R., & Abdi, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Education and the politics of difference: Canadian perspectives*. Toronto, Canada: Canadian Scholar's Press.
- Gough, N. (2007a). Changing planes: Rhizosemiotic play in transnational curriculum inquiry. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 26(3), 279–294.
- Gough, N. (2007b). Rhizosemiotic play and the generative of fiction. *Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education*, 4(1), 119–124.
- Gough, N. (2008). Ecology, ecocriticism and learning: How do places become pedagogical? *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, 5(1), 71–86.
- Gould, G. (1967, December 28). *The idea of the North* [Radio broadcast episode]. In P. Webb and W. A. Young (Producers), *Ideas*. Toronto, Canada: Canadian Broadcast Corporation Radio.
- Gould, G. (1969, November 12). *The late comers* [Radio broadcast episode]. In P. Webb and W. A. Young (Producers), *Ideas*. Toronto, Canada: Canadian Broadcast Corporation Radio.
- Gould, G. (1977, April 25). *The quiet in the land* [Radio broadcast episode]. In P. Webb and W. A. Young (Producers), *Ideas*. Toronto, Canada: Canadian Broadcast Corporation Radio.

- Grant, T. (2012, December 11). Canadian debt levels reach a new high. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/economy/canadian-household-debt-levels-reach-a-new-high/article6323546/>.
- Grumet, M. R. (1987). The politics of personal knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 17(3), 319–329.
- Grumet, M. R. (1988). *Bitter milk: Women and teaching*. Boston, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Haig-Brown. (2001). Seeking Honest Justice in a Land of Strangers: Nahnebahwequa's Struggle for Land. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 36(4), 143-170.
- Haig-Brown, C. (2008). Taking indigenous thought seriously: A rant on globalization with some cautionary notes. *Journal of the Canadian Association of Curriculum Studies*, 6(2), 8–24.
- Hasebe-Ludt, E., Chambers, C. & Leggo, C. (2009). *Life writing and literary métissage as an ethos for our times*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Hay, E. (2007). *Late nights on air*. Mississauga, ON: McClelland & Stewart.
- Hurren, W. & Hasebe-Ludt, E. (2011). Bringing curriculum down to earth the terroir that we are. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 27(2), 17–34.
- Hurren, W. & Hasebe-Ludt, E. (2014). *Contemplating curriculum: Genealogies/times/places*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Ibrahim, A. (2008a). Operating under erasure: Race/language/identity. *Canadian and International Education Journal*, 37(2), 56–76.
- Ibrahim, A. (2008b). The new flâneur: Subaltern cultural studies, African youth in Canada, and the semiology of in-betweenness. *Cultural Studies*, 22(2), 234–253.
- Irwin, R. L. (2003). Toward an aesthetic of unfolding in/sights through curriculum. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 1(2), 63–78.
- Irwin, R. L. (2004). A/r/tography: A metonymic métissage. In R. L. Irwin & A. de Cosson (Eds.), *A/r/tography: Rendering Self Through Arts-based Living Inquiry*, (pp. 27–38). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Irwin, R. L. (2006). Walking to create an aesthetic and spiritual currere. *Visual Arts Research*, 32(1), 75–82.
- Jardine, D. (2006). Youth demands images for its imagination and for forming its memory. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 22(3), 71–80.
- Jardine, D. (2008a). On the while of things. *Journal for the Advancement of American Association of Curriculum Studies*, 4, n.p.
- Jardine, D. (2008b). Translating water. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 24(1), 11–19.
- Jenson, J. & Brushwood Rose, C. (2007). *Policy unplugged: Dis/connections between technology policies and practices in Canadian schools*. Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Johnston, I. & Richardson, G. (2012). Homi Bhabha and Canadian curriculum studies: Beyond the comforts of the dialectic. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 10(1), 116–137.

- Joshee, R., & Sinfield, I. (2010). The Canadian multicultural education policy web: Lessons to learn, pitfalls to avoid. *Multicultural Education Review*, 2(1), 55–75.
- Kanu, Y. (2003). Curriculum as cultural practice: Postcolonial imagination. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 1(1), 67–81.
- Kanu, Y. (Ed.). (2009). *Curriculum as cultural practice: Postcolonial imaginations*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Kanu, Y. (2011). *Integrating Aboriginal perspectives into the school curriculum*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Kanu, Y. & Glor, M. (2006). 'Currere' to the rescue? Teachers as 'amateur intellectuals' in a knowledge society. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 4(2), 101–122.
- King, T. (2012). *The inconvenient Indian: A curious account of Native people in North America*. Toronto, ON: DoubleDay Canada.
- Krasny, K. & Brushwood Rose, C. (2013). Canadian Curriculum Studies: Ethics, Aesthetics, and Affect. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 11(1), 3-12.
- Kulnieks, D., Longboat, R, & Young, K. (Eds.). (2013). *Contemporary studies in environmental and Indigenous pedagogies: A curricula of stories and place*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Leggo, C. (2004). The curriculum of joy: Six poetic ruminations. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 2(2), 27–42.
- Leggo, C. (2007). The syntax of silence. *Journal of Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 5(1), 94–101.

- Leggo, C. (2010). Writing a life: Representation in language and image. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, 7(2), 47–61.
- Leggo, C. (2011). Living love: Confessions of a fearful teacher. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 9(1), 115–144.
- Lewkowich, D. (2009). Landwash readers: A space of collective reading in the medical humanities. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 7(1), 85–110.
- Lewkowich, D. (2011). Burning at the edges: Judith P. Robertson and the provocations of reading. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 8(2), 76–93.
- Lewkowich, D. (2012). Poaching in the chords of reading: Dwelling in the murky spaces of the literary landwash. In N. Ng-A-Fook & J. Rottmann (Eds.), *Reconsidering Canadian Curriculum Studies*, (pp. 207–217). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lloyd, R. J. (2011). Running with and like my dog: An animate curriculum for living life beyond the track. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 27(3), 117–133.
- Lloyd, R. J. (2012). Hooping through interdisciplinary intertwinings: Curriculum, kin/aesthetic ethics, and energetic vulnerabilities. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 10(1), 4–27.
- Lloyd, R. J. (2012). Breastfeeding mothers and lovers: An ebbing and flowing curriculum of the fluid embrace. In S. Springgay's & D. Freedman (Eds.), *Mothering a Bodied Curriculum: Emplacement, Desire, Affect*, (pp. 270–293). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

- Lund, D., Panayotidis, L., Smits, H. & Towers, J. (2006). Fragmenting narratives: The ethics of narrating difference. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 4(1), 1–23.
- Malewski, E. & Jaramillo, N. (Eds.). (2011). *Epistemologies of ignorance*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Matthews, S. (2009). To placate or provoke? A critical review of the disciplines approach to history curriculum. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 7(2), 86–109.
- Milburn, G. & Herbert, J. (1974). *National consciousness and the curriculum: The Canadian case*. Toronto, ON: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Miller, J. (2004). *Sounds of silence breaking*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Miller, J. (2014). *Living tensions in curriculum studies: Communities without consensus in transitory times*. New York, NY: Routledge Press.
- Mishra Tarc, A. (2011a). Curriculum as difficult inheritance. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 8(1), 15–18.
- Mishra Tarc, A. (2011b). Reparative curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 41(3), 350–372.
- Montgomery, K. (2005). Imagining the antiracist state: Representations of racism in Canadian history textbooks. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 26(4), 427–442.
- Morawski, C., & Palulis, P. (2009). Auto/ethno/graphies as teaching lives: An aesthetics of difference. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 25(2), 6–24.

- Munro, P. (1998a). *Subject to fiction*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Munro, P. (1998b). Engendering curriculum history. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum Toward New Identities*, (pp. 263–294). New York, NY: Garland Publishing.
- Nahachewsky, J. & Johnston, I. (Eds.). (2009). *Beyond “presentism”: Re-imagining the historical, personal, and social places of curriculum*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Naqvi, R. & Smits, H. (Eds.). (2012). *Thinking about and enacting curriculum in “frames of war.”* New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Nellis, R. (2005). “Trans/formational spectral narrative: Not giving up the ghost!” *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 3(1), 41–49.
- Ng-A-Fook, N. (2009). Inhabiting the hyphenated spaces of alienation and appropriation: *Currere*, language, and postcolonial migrant subjectivities. In J. Nahachewsky and I. Johnson (Eds.), *Beyond Presentism*, (pp. 87–103). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense publishers.
- Ng-A-Fook, N. (2011a). Provoking a Canadian curriculum theory project: a question of/for *curre*re, *denkbild* and aesthetics. *Media: Culture: Pedagogy*, 15(2), 1–26.
- Ng-A-Fook, N. (2011b). Decolonizing narrative strands of our eco-civic responsibilities: Curriculum, social action, and Indigenous communities. In K. Young & D. Stanley (Eds.), *Contemporary Studies in Canadian Curriculum: Principals, Portraits, and Practices*, (pp. 313–341). Calgary, AB: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

- Ng-A-Fook, N. (2013a). Reconsidering our attendance to curriculum development as...events, subjectivities, and a cosmopolitan praxis. *Journal for the American Association for Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 9(1), 1–16.
- Ng-A-Fook, N. (2013b). Fishing for knowledge beyond colonial disciplines: Curriculum, social action projects, and Indigenous communities. In A. Kulnieks, D. Roronhiakewen Longboat, & K. A. Young, (Eds.), *Contemporary Studies in Environmental and Indigenous Pedagogies: A Curricula of Stories and Place*, (pp. 285–305). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Ng-A-Fook, N. & Rottmann, J. (Eds.). (2012). *Reconsidering Canadian curriculum studies*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ng-A-Fook, N. & Radford, L. & Ausman, T. (2012). Living a curriculum of hyph-e-nations: Diversity, equity, and social media. *Multicultural Educational Review*, 4(2), 91–128.
- Oberg, A. (2004a). Supervision as a creative act. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 2(1), 227–238.
- Oberg, A. (2004b). Reflecting on reflecting. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 2(1), 239–244.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (2008). *Finding common ground: Character development in Ontario schools, K–12*. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (2009). *Ontario's equity and inclusive education strategy*. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

- Ontario Ministry of Education. (2010). *A sound investment: Financial literacy education in Ontario Schools*. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Osborne, K. (1982). 'The Canadian curriculum': A Response to Barrow. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 7(2), 94–109.
- Pinar, W. F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pinar, W. F. (2006). *The synoptic text today and other essays: Curriculum development after the reconceptualization*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F. (2007). *Intellectual advancement through disciplinarity: Verticality and horizontality in curriculum studies*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishing.
- Pinar, W. F. (2008a). "Introduction." In G. Tomkins (Ed.), *A Common Countenance: Stability and Change in the Canadian Curriculum*, (pp. xi–xxiv). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Pinar, W. F. (2008b). Introduction to a common countenance. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 6(2), 129–155.
- Pinar, W. F. (2008c). A portrait of Bill Doll. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 6(1), 21–23.
- Pinar, W. F. (2009). *The worldliness of a cosmopolitan education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pinar, W. F. (2011). Nationalism, anti-Americanism, Canadian identity. In L. Yates & M. Grumet (Eds.), *World Yearbook of Education 2011: Curriculum in Today's World*, (pp. 31–41). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Pinar, W. F. (2013). *International handbook of curriculum research* (2nd Edition). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Pinto, L.E. (2012). *Curriculum reform in Ontario*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Pinto, L. & Coulson, E. (2011). Social justice and the gender politics of financial literacy education. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 9(2), 54–85.
- Radford, L. (2009). Apprenticing teachers reading: The cultural significance of juvenile melodrama. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 7(2), 58–84.
- Ralston S. J. (2008). *A fair country: Telling truths about Canada*. Toronto, ON: Viking Canada.
- Robertson, J., Lewkowich, D., & Rottmann, J. (2010). Saltwater chronicles: Reading representational spaces in selected book clubs in St. John's. *Newfoundland Island Studies Journal*, 5(2), 141–164.
- Sameshima, P., & Leggo, C. (2013). How do you spell love? Curricular conversations. *Creative Approaches to Research*, 6(1), 89–109.
- Slattery, P. (2012). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era: Teaching and learning in an age of accountability*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Smith, D. (2009). Postcolonialism and globalization: Thoughts towards a new hermeneutic pedagogy. In Y. Kanu (Ed.), *Curriculum as Cultural Practice: Postcolonial Imaginations*, (pp. 251–259). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

- Smith, D. (2011). Can wisdom trump the market as a basis for education?. In D. Stanley & K. Young (Eds.), *Contemporary Studies in Canadian Curriculum: Principles, Portraits, & Practices*, (pp. 153–187). Calgary, AB: Detselig.
- Smith, D. (2003). Curriculum and teaching face globalization. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research*, (pp. 35–52). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Smits, H. (2008). Is a Canadian curriculum studies possible? (What are the conditions of possibility?): Some preliminary notes for further inquiry. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 6(2), 97–112.
- Smits, H. (2011). Nocturne and fugue: Canadian curriculum theory As Possibility. In D. Stanley and K. Young (Eds.), *Contemporary Studies in Canadian Curriculum: Principles, Portraits, & Practices*, (pp. 47–76). Calgary, AB: Detselig.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. London, UK: Zed Books.
- Snowber, C. N. (1999). The eros of listening: Dancing into presence. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 15(3), 17–25.
- Snowber, C. N. (2002). A Curriculum of beauty. *Teacher Educational Quarterly*, 29(4), 119–123.
- Snowber, C. & Wiebe, S. (2011). The visceral imagination: A fertile for non- textual knowing. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 27(2), 101–113.

- Social Sciences and the Humanities Council for Research. (2013). *Insight Program*. Retrieved from http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/umbrella_programs-programme_cadre/insight-savoir-eng.aspx.
- Springgay, S. (2005). An intimate distance: Youth interrogations of intercorporeal cartography as visual narrative text. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 3(1), 107–122.
- Springgay, S. (2011). The Ethico-aesthetics of affect and a sensational pedagogy. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 9(1), 66–82.
- Springgay, S. & Freedman, D. (Eds.). (2012). *Mothering a bodied curriculum: Emplacement, desire, affect*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Stanley, D. & Young, K. (Eds.). (2011a). *Contemporary studies in Canadian curriculum: Principles, portraits, & practices*. Calgary, AB: Detselig Enterprises LTD.
- Stanley, D., & Young, K. (2011b). Conceptualizing complexities of curriculum: Developing a lexicon for ecojustice and the transdisciplinarity of bodies. *Journal Of Curriculum Theorizing*, 27(1), 36–47.
- Stanley, T. (2011). *Contesting white supremacy: School segregation, anti-racism, and the making of Chinese Canadians*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

- Sumara, D., Davis, B. & Laidlaw, L. (2001). Canadian identity and curriculum theory: An ecological, postmodern perspective. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 26(2), 144–163.
- Sumara, D. & Luce-Kapler, R. (2003). Inventing new vocabularies for curriculum studies in Canada. *Journal of the Canadian Association of Curriculum Studies*, 1(1), 1–8.
- Taubman, P. M. (2012). *Disavowed knowledge: Psychoanalysis, education, and teaching*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tomkins, G. (1986/2008). *A common countenance: Stability and change in the Canadian curriculum*. Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Trifonas, P. P. (2004). Postmodernism, poststructuralism and difference. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 20(1), 151–163.
- Trifonas, P. P. (2006). Of knowledge, science, and epistemological postmodernity. *Journal Of Curriculum Theorizing*, 22(4), 135–140.
- Trifonas, P. P. (2008). The cosmopolitical from a deconstructive point of view. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 24(1), 71–73.
- Tuck, E. & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2013). Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 29(1), 72–89.
- Tupper, J. & Cappello, M. (2008). Teaching treaties as (un)usual narratives: disrupting the curricular commonsense. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 38(5), 559–578.
- Wadhams, W. (1992, October 2). *Idea of Canada* [Radio broadcast]. Toronto, ON: Canadian Broadcast Corporation Radio.
- Wagamese, R. (2012). *Indian horse*. Madeira Park, BC: Douglas & McIntyre

- Watt, D. (2011). From the streets of peshawar to the cover of Maclean's magazine: Reading images of Muslim women as currere to interrupt gendered islamophobia. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 27(1), 64–86.
- Weber, S. & Mitchell, C. (2003). Collaboration and coauthorship: Reflections from the inside. *Journal for the Canadian Association of Curriculum Studies*, 1(1), 83–91.
- Weenie, A. (2008). Curricular theorizing from the periphery. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 38(5), 545–557.